

REMARKS

Applicants previously submitted a response on March 14, 2007. Claims 1-14, 16-17 and 19-20 are pending in this application. Applicants have amended independent claims 5, 7 and 10-13 in a manner similar to independent claim 1, which was amended in the previous amendment submitted on March 14, 2007. Care has been exercised to avoid the introduction of new matter. Adequate descriptive support for the present Supplemental Amendment should be apparent throughout the originally filed disclosure as, for example, the depicted embodiments and related discussion thereof in the written description of the specification. Applicants submit that the present Supplemental Amendment does not generate any new matter issue. Entry of the present Supplemental Amendment is respectfully solicited. It is believed that this response places this case in condition for allowance. Hence, prompt favorable reconsideration of this case is solicited.

Claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Jones et al. (U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2004/0153408, hereinafter “Jones”). Applicants respectfully traverse.

The present claimed subject matter, as described in each of independent claims 1, 5, 7 and 10-13, recites a banknote handling device comprising, inter alia, a counterfeit processing module that stores each banknote determined as counterfeit into the counterfeit collection box and prohibits the stored counterfeit banknote from being returned to the customer. The independent claims further require a notification module that notifies the customer of predetermined kind of information. The information provided for the customer, in the notification, is indicative of a total amount of money received from the customer and is indicative of an amount of money settled as a transaction; regardless of the result of the counterfeit detection by the discrimination module. Thus, the two features of the present claimed

subject matter are summarized as follows: (a) a counterfeit banknote is recovered into a counterfeit collection box and is not returned to a customer; and (b) the customer is notified of information for specifying a total amount of money received from the customer, including any received counterfeit banknotes.

Each of the independent claims have been amended to further clarify an aspect already believed present in the claim, that is, the customer is notified of the total amount of money, which includes any counterfeit notes received from the customer as well as genuine notes. As described in the specification, the customer is notified of the amount of received counterfeit banknotes, as well as genuine banknotes, otherwise, the customer would be confused by a display that indicates a total amount of received genuine banknotes, especially since the devices of the present claimed subject matter do not return the counterfeit banknotes.

In contrast to the various recitations of independent claims 1, 5, 7 and 10-13, Jones, at numbered paragraph [0013] and step 236 in Fig. 11a, discloses that only genuine banknotes, not counterfeit banknotes, are counted and that the total amount  $B_{total}$  is the total amount of the genuine banknotes. Jones does not present a total amount including both genuine and counterfeit banknotes as required in each of independent claims 1, 5, 7 and 10-13.

Accordingly, Jones fails to disclose or remotely suggest every limitation of independent claims 1, 5, 7 and 10-13. As such, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 predicated upon Jones is not legally viable.

Applicants refer to their previous Remarks submitted on March 14, 2007, which address the remaining rejections.

It is believed that the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Applicants therefore respectfully request an early and favorable reconsideration and allowance of this

application. If there are any outstanding issues which might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' representative at the telephone number shown below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Brian K. Seidleck  
Registration No. 51,321

600 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005-3096  
Phone: 202.756.8000 BKS:idw  
Facsimile: 202.756.8087  
**Date: March 27, 2007**

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277  
as our correspondence address.**